

DRAFT DO NOT CITE WITHOUT AUTHORS' PERMISSION

*Lessons for WIA Assessments from the New Jersey Workforce
Development Partnership Program*

Julie Whittaker
Department of Public Policy &
Heldrich Center for Workforce Development
Rutgers University
New Brunswick NJ 08901
jwhittak@rci.rutgers.edu

Aaron Fichtner
Heldrich Center for Workforce Development
Rutgers University
New Brunswick NJ 08901
fichtner@rci.rutgers.edu

Acknowledgements:

The opinions and beliefs expressed within this paper are our own and are not representative of either the Heldrich Center or the New Jersey Workforce System. We both express our sincere gratitude to Leela Hebbar who managed the day-to-day activities of the New Jersey WDP evaluation, ran most of the data analysis, as well as answered many questions on the WIA requirements.

Abstract:

Training programs are one set of governmental interventions employed to aid workers in their search for employment security. The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 has important effects on all training interventions, including the process of evaluation and funding of individual training accounts and employer-provided customized training programs. The New Jersey Workforce Development Partnership (WDP) program, created in 1993 and funded by a portion of existing tax revenues collected from the Unemployment Insurance payroll tax, provides \$9 million per year in training vouchers for dislocated workers and \$15 million per year to support employer-provided training efforts. The Heldrich Center for Workforce Development at Rutgers University has completed a comprehensive evaluation of both programs using multiple methodologies to measure wage and employment impacts. These impacts were measured by using UI wage records, a comparison group, telephone surveys and site visits. Our study summarizes the results of this evaluation and discusses relevant lessons for the implementation of WIA and workforce security programs across the country.

The Individual Training Grant (ITG) program of WDP provides \$4,000 training vouchers to dislocated workers. Results of the evaluation and the additional analysis demonstrate that while individual grants are somewhat effective in aiding dislocated workers' wage recovery, using UI wage records is an incomplete strategy for evaluation. Comparison group analyses and telephone interviews supply additional comparative benchmarking, leading to a more accurate measure of increased workforce security than would have occurred without the intervention.

The Customized Training (CT) grant program of WDP provides grants to firms and consortia of firms to assist them in the training of their employees. The evaluation surveys firms that received grants, individuals who received training through the program and in-depth case studies of selected grant recipients. Results of the evaluation and the additional analysis demonstrate that customized training programs can be an effective strategy for providing training to individuals with low levels of formal education who had previously received little formal training. Participation in the CT program also leads to increases in firm provided training after the grant-funded activities have been completed.

Introduction

The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 has far reaching implications for the evaluation of all federally funded workforce-training programs. WIA strongly suggests or requires certain common performance measures across programs: measures of wage recovery, employment and retention, program completion rates, and satisfaction measures among others. Furthermore, the WIA requirement of individual training vouchers for the disbursement of training services is a significant divergence from earlier workforce acts. These vouchers, Individual Training Accounts (ITAs), become the main vehicle for bringing services to the client population. With the incorporation of ITAs into the workforce system, WIA is also very clear in its requirements that the systems clients/consumers must have up-to-date information on the performance of the training programs and providers in order to make appropriate choices for training. As a result WIA imposes exact requirements in measuring the efficacy of the programs.

WIA also leaves open the possibility of disbursing funds to employers to training potential new hires. Thus, customized training programs for firms are now eligible for some federal WIA funds.

The New Jersey State Legislature created the Workforce Development Partnership (WDP) Program in 1992 in order to provide employment and training services to “qualified, displaced, disadvantaged and employed workers.” The services were required to give the greatest opportunity for long-range career advancement with training in skills that had high levels of productivity and earning power. For our analysis we will focus primarily on two initiatives within WDP¹: the Individual Training Grant

¹ Other components of the WDP program are occupational safety and health, youth

(ITG) program for displaced workers and the Customized Training (CT) program for incumbent and new workers. The ITG program is a grant for individual workers to enroll in training from designated providers in order to obtain new skills and jobs. The CT program is a firm or consortia based award for training incumbent workers. The state of New Jersey's legislature required detailed evaluations of these state funded workforce development initiatives. Since the New Jersey programs serve populations similar to those populations eligible for federal programs now under the WIA umbrella, the lessons learned during the evaluation of the WDP program are valuable in anticipating the evaluation and continued implementation of WIA.

In this paper we demonstrate some of the potential benefits, problems, and solutions involved with the WIA program performance measures and some lessons learned from the WDP evaluation. Understanding the implications of this more rigorous (and rigid) system of evaluation is important for effective workforce development programs. The paper begins with a detailed description of the WDP program. Second, the ITG and CT evaluations are discussed and expanded. Finally, the implications for workforce policy and for current federal performance measures are explored.

Lessons from WDP: Individual Training Grants for Dislocated Workers

In 1992 in the midst of an economic recession and threatened by the continued loss of manufacturing employment, the New Jersey State Legislature enacted the Workforce Development Partnership Program. A portion of existing tax revenues collected from the Unemployment Insurance payroll tax funded this program. The

transitions to work, 8% funds, and Addition Benefits During Training. These are not included in our discussion.

program was designed to "provide qualified, displaced, disadvantaged and employed workers with the employment and training services most likely to provide the greatest opportunity for long-range career advancement with high levels of productivity and earning power." In addition to providing training grants to dislocated workers, the WDP program substantially expanded the state subsidized, employer provided training program and included new regulations to guide the implementation of the program.

The actual implementation of the NJ WDP program began in late 1993. This study evaluates workers who participated in the individual training grant program from 1994 through 1996. The NJ Department of Labor awarded grants to dislocated workers in order to aid in their funding of training at state approved programs. These programs are independent of the WDP administrators. The providers of these training services are varied and included community colleges, universities, unions, and proprietary schools. The particular training sessions were in equally diverse areas; programs that individuals attended include truck driving, software classes, and remedial education.

Despite the legislature's clear intention to improve the prospects of dislocated workers, the training was generally limited in duration and in funds. Workers received an average ITG grant of \$3187². The average duration of the training period was 5.8 months. Over one-third of the training programs lasted less than 3 months and one-third were more than 6 months.

The ITG program relies heavily upon the identification of dislocated workers by workforce system administrators and by self-identification. As a result, ITG recipients are not identical to those individuals that received Unemployment Insurance benefits from

² All dollar amounts are in 1996 CPI-U adjusted dollars.

the state of New Jersey even if the measured demographic data were identical. These selection bias issues are similar to those faced by most dislocated worker programs.

Measuring the Effectiveness of the ITG Program: Implications for Performance Measures under WIA

In the research and evaluation of voucher-based training programs there has been a continued scarcity of information for reliably estimating the programs' effects on participants' wage recovery and re-employment. The importance of administrative data has increased as the rate and frequency of reliance on voucher-based systems such as the New Jersey ITG program and federal ITA programs thrive. State UI wage data have been held as the most cost-effective way to evaluate providers of services and the participants' outcomes. In addition, WIA requires that UI wage data be used as the primary source of information for the calculation of performance measures. However, UI wage data may not consistently estimate and track worker outcomes. Specifically, the records currently do not allow for states to adequately track workers who find work in another state, workers who become self-employed, and workers who find work in any uncovered sector of employers. Also, these records do not have clear measures of the selection bias inherent in any voluntary training program.

The evaluation of WDP incorporated UI wage records as well as the program's administrative data, and customer satisfaction phone interview data. The state of New Jersey, like all states, collects Unemployment Insurance Wage data from employers when they pay their quarterly Unemployment Insurance payroll taxes. As a result, these data are not collected with the express intent to track and record the earnings history of all

covered sector workers who work within New Jersey. Data contain information on quarterly earnings and weeks worked at each employer. The data do not give information on hours worked nor on hourly wages.

Administrative data collected by the New Jersey Department of Labor for the WDP program form an integral part of the analysis. These data include information on all individuals that received an ITG grant from 1994-1996. The data were collected at the issue of a training contract. They offer detailed information on demographic characteristics of the participating dislocated worker (age, race, educational attainment, and union membership) as well characteristics of the training program in which the worker enrolls (grant amount, dates of training, type of training, and type of training provider).

The John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development conducted two telephone surveys of program participants for the New Jersey State Employment and Training Commission, which oversees the implementation of the ITG program. The two surveys were conducted with individuals who had received ITG grants in 1994, 1995, 1996. In February and March of 1998, 1573 individuals were surveyed. The response rate was 59 percent. In July 1999 these same individuals were contacted again to determine if their opinions of the ITG program had changed and to find out additional information on their perceptions about the impact of the program. Nearly two-thirds of those surveyed in 1998 were successfully contacted. Surveys were completed with 1002 individuals. Questions included information about formal training since completing school, the reasons for enrolling in ITG, perceptions of the ITG program and the training

received as well as perceived value of the training, use of skills received in first job after training, and perceived impact of training on employment prospects, earnings.

To place the outcomes of ITG recipients in a larger context, the wage recovery and re-employment rates of ITG recipients were compared to those of similarly unemployed individuals who did not participate in the ITG program. When random-assignment experiments are not feasible, there is substantial research that indicates that a properly selected comparison group can yield important relational comparisons for training interventions. (Barnow, Cain and Goldberger, 1980; Ashenfelter, 1978) These comparisons will not be without faults and should be viewed critically since there is substantial evidence that small changes in specification of the measures can result in different outcomes. (Ashenfelter and Card, 1985; LaLonde, 1986.)

A comparison group of 7,786 individuals was selected through stratified random sampling of all individuals that received Unemployment Insurance benefits from the state of New Jersey during the time that benefits were received by ITG recipients in 1994, 1995 or 1996. As a result, the stratification of the sample was based on gender, educational attainment, year of Unemployment Insurance claim, and the weekly benefit rate (WBR) quartile indicating the UI benefit level received (as a measure of pre-unemployment earnings). The random sample was then weighted to correct for differences between the ITG and the comparison within WBR quartile-race-sex-education distributions.

ITG recipients cannot be considered identical to those individuals that received Unemployment Insurance benefits from the state of New Jersey but did not receive a training voucher. While the comparison group and those receiving an ITG grant were

similar in many observable characteristics, there are many unobservable characteristics on which they may differ. For example, ITG recipients may have had more barriers to becoming re-employed than those members of the comparison group. In most cases, individuals received training through the ITG program because they believed -- or the local ITG program staff believed -- that they did not possess the skills necessary to obtain employment and were in need of additional training.

Conversely, during the study period, individuals -- identified by program administrators as possessing skills needed by employers -- were encouraged to continue their search for employment and were not offered the opportunity to receive an ITG grant. In addition, the ITG program was a voluntary program. Those individuals who believed that they did not need additional skills to obtain employment were not likely to pursue an ITG grant. It was not possible to take these unobservable characteristics into account when selecting a comparison group, but instead this knowledge must be used to critically interpret results.

Results of the WDP-ITG Evaluation: Implications for WIA Implementation

The ITG program was considered a success by many measures. It was found to be an effective intervention in aiding displaced workers regain a foothold in the labor market. However, our results show that dislocated workers in general -- and in an extremely positive economy in particular -- face a long and difficult journey in finding new employment and recovering earlier wage rates. However, training when appropriately targeted can be an effective strategy in mitigating this tremendously difficult situation.

In all the WDP program awarded 8,910 Individual Training Grants in 1994, 1995 and 1996 with 8532 individuals receiving these grants. A total of \$27.9 million was awarded in ITG during these years.

The majority of ITG recipients (62 percent) were women, a percentage that was consistent throughout 1994, 1995 and 1996. The ages of ITG recipients were diverse with the majority (55 percent) between the ages of 36 and 54. One-third of all recipients were under the age of 36. Finally, 68 percent of all grant recipients were white, 18 percent were African-American and 11 percent were Hispanic.

Approximately 46 percent of all ITG recipients received business and administration training through the ITG program; such training includes general office / clerical training and accounting. The second most frequent training was computer and information technology training, with 12 percent receiving this type of training. Women were more likely to be enrolled in business and administration training than were men. While over half (61 percent) of women received training in business and administration, only 26 percent of men received this type of training.

Unemployment Insurance wage records were used to estimate the employment status of all ITG recipients in the period of time after they filed for UI benefits and completed training. As in the case of ITG participants, Unemployment Insurance wage records were used to construct wage histories and to calculate wage recovery rates for the comparison group. Wage recovery was measured from the time an individual filed for UI benefits. These results have been recalibrated from the original report submitted to the state of New Jersey. In particular, the original evaluation used a different base period (wages from four-quarters before filing for UI benefits) and used only one quarter of

earnings records for the current earnings. Our study reestimated these earnings in order that they be comparable to the current WIA measures: the base period is an average of the third and second quarter before filing for UI benefits, the current earnings is an average of the second and third quarters after completing training.

It was assumed that an individual was employed if an Unemployment Insurance wage record was available for the worker in a given quarter. However, UI wage records are not available for all employed residents of the state. Unemployment Insurance wage records are not reported for those individuals who are employed outside of the state, or employed by the US military, or who are self-employed. These individuals accounted for an estimated 17 percent of all employed New Jersey residents in 1990. In a survey of ITG recipients conducted in 1999, 14.3 percent reported that they were employed out of state, self-employed, or by the United States military. Thus, due to limitations of this source of information, the employment rates reported underestimate the percentage of ITG recipients that were employed at any given time. As a result, these employment rates were most instructive when used to compare the employment outcomes of particular sub-groups of ITG recipients.

The analysis suggests the using New Jersey UI wage records for measuring employment outcomes has very different effects for the different types of workers and for different demographic groups, in particular for those with low-level educational achievement. Re-employment rates for workers who received training are substantially higher than for those who did not receive training.

However, differences in recovered wages, and reemployment rates for specific demographic groups are substantial with approximately 11 percent reporting some form

of self-employment. Furthermore, participant survey data show a positive relationship with workers who would not have been judged a success under UI wage record analysis.

Generally the ITG program did not achieve the performance goals that are outlined for dislocated worker programs in New Jersey. The wage replacement rate, and the employment rates were substantially lower than the performance standards. The continued employment goals were met, although with fewer employed participants and thus, only marginally met the goal. However, the customer satisfaction levels were exceedingly positive, and met the WIA goal.

The row labeled “2nd quarter after training” in Table 1 calculates the WIA measure for wage recovery. The row labeled “2nd quarter after training” in Table 2 calculates the WIA measure for employment status. The majority of these measures indicate that the NJ ITG program was not successful in finding equivalent jobs for the displaced workers. In fact, many were unable to find employment and those who did find employment were unlikely to receive equivalent wages. This was difficult to reconcile to such overwhelmingly positive assessments by the intervention participant (88-90 percent positive).

However, other measures allow us to take a different perspective in analyzing the WDP program. Specifically, in the ITG evaluation, wage recovery rates and employment rates were calculated for each quarter from the quarter after filing for UI benefits to three years after completing training. These calculations were also done for the comparison group as well as for major demographic groups within both the ITG participants and the Comparison group. Thus, we rephrased our assessment as: does the ITG intervention

significantly improve the prospects of displaced workers over time and in comparison to similar workers who did not participate in the program?

Thus, the NJ WDP evaluation expanded the scope of analysis through the incorporation of a comparison group where the outcomes of the similar workers in the comparison group are considered. Here, we find that the comparison group does not always do better than the ITG participants, and in fact ITG participants do better in several of the measures. Generally, the ITG group does better or the same as the comparison group in wage recovery when using the 'post-training approach' suggested by the WIA measures. However, comparing the ITG participants' wage recovery from the quarter after filing for UI finds that the comparison group generally does better, although this difference erodes over time.

For certain demographic groups there was clear evidence the ITG participants fared better than the comparison group. Tables 3-8 (located in the appendix) explore the different outcomes based upon gender, race, and educational level.

Workers with lower levels of education generally did better under the training intervention. This was especially true of the workers with less than a high school education. Conversely, those with at least some college education or a college degree did better in the comparison group than in the intervention. Women also fared better in the ITG group than in the comparison group on many measures

As the period of analysis is extended to one- and two-years from the end of training, the ITG program produces sustained, long-term positive results. In the first full quarter after completing training, ITG recipients recovered 52% of their earnings. As more individuals became employed and obtained better paying jobs, average quarterly

earnings increased steadily. Three full years after completing training, ITG recipients recovered 98 percent of their earnings. Reemployment levels for the ITG participants in the first quarter after completing training was 55 percent, the fourth quarter was 59 percent and the eighth quarter was 68 percent.

These positive, long-term achievements may be a result of the implied long-term objective of the WDP program and thus may not generally be expected in the typical dislocated worker intervention. However, since the average training grant and period was relatively short, this intervention is relatively represented of a typical intervention.

The ITG program exceeded the performance standards for customer satisfaction. One additional measure calculated in our evaluation took advantage of our ability to link questionnaire responses back to the UI and WDP records. In Table 9 we linked replies to queries on ITG satisfaction to employment and earnings outcomes.

Those participants who had done very well (working and reporting better than expected outcomes) reported that they found the training to be highly valuable 42 percent of the time; another 41 percent reported that it was somewhat valuable. In comparison the group who had not done as well (working but reported worse than expected outcomes) reported 29 percent of the time that the training program was highly valuable, while 52 percent of them reported that it was somewhat valuable. Thus, while overall both groups were positive overall about the rewards to their training, those who had done better reported more highly positive perceptions. Likewise, while 6 percent of those who had done very well reported that the training was not valuable at all, just fewer than 11 percent of those who hadn't done as well reported dissatisfaction with the training.

Similarly, slightly more program participants who fared better than expected rated their satisfaction with the program to be highly positive (65 percent) than those who had not fare as well (57 percent). There was a small difference in the reporting of somewhat positive response with the higher group reporting slightly fewer somewhat positive experience (23 percent) to those of the lower performance group (27 percent). Both groups each expressed similar levels of dissatisfaction (approximately 5 percent).

Lessons from WDP: Customized Training Grants for the Training of Incumbent Workers

The New Jersey Customized Training (CT) grant program provides firms, consortia of firms and labor unions with grants to assist firms in upgrading the skills of their employees. The program was designed to assist firms to remain competitive and increase the skills of employed individuals. The CT program, administered by the Division of Business Services of the New Jersey Department of Labor, is clearly focused on improving the economic competitiveness of New Jersey firms. Grant recipients are given flexibility in determining the training to be provided to ensure that training activities will meet the specific needs of a firm. The program also is used as part of the state's economic development incentives to convince existing firms to remain in the state and to convince firms to relocate to the state.

Due to a strong economy, decreases in the number of dislocated workers in need of training and an increase in federal spending for dislocated worker programs, an increasing share of the WDP program funds have gone to the CT program. In 1994 to

1996, 64% of the resources of the program were allocated for the CT program. In 1998-99, the New Jersey customized training program had a budget of \$20 million, ranking the state as the ninth largest program in the country (Duscha and Graves, 1999). The state spends \$5.27 per capita on customized training program, ranking the state 15th in the nation.

From 1994 through 1996, the study period for this evaluation, the New Jersey Department of Labor awarded 226 customized training grants to firms and consortiums. Over \$48.7 million was awarded during this time period. Firms and consortiums contributed an additional \$88.7 million to the training activities and planned to use these combined resources to train 54,818 individuals and to create 145,640 training slots.

Grant recipients are selected after completing a series of applications and are selected according to defined criteria designed to maximize the government's investment. Grant recipients are required to contribute an equal amount of their own resources to the training effort and to develop a long-term plan for the training needs of the company. Grant recipients design training programs based on the needs of the company. While some states require that training providers be selected by the state, New Jersey allows recipients to select training providers from any in the state. For those firms that have a unionized workforce, union leadership must be involved in the design and implementation of the training program.

Grant recipients can provide either on-the-job training or classroom training to employees. To fund on-the-job training that is provided to individuals while they are completing the tasks of their jobs, the State of New Jersey reimburses the companies for half of the wages of the individual. For classroom training, provided either in a classroom

at the job site or at an off-site location such as a community college, the State reimburses recipients for a percentage of the cost of that training. In addition to providing training directly related to the completion of a job, the State allows grant recipients to use funds for safety and health training, basic skills training including English as a Second Language and team building training.

The Heldrich Center's evaluation used five different sources of information. Administrative data was analyzed to create a profile of Customized Training grants awarded in 1994, 1995 and 1996. To estimate the impact that the grants had on companies, a telephone survey was conducted with firms that received a grant. To determine the impact of training on employees, telephone surveys were conducted with individuals that received on-the-job training funded by a CT grant. Unemployment Insurance (UI) wage records were used to determine the employment status and earnings of individuals who received on-the-job training. Finally, in-depth case studies were conducted with 7 firms and 2 consortia that received a CT grant. These case studies included interviews and focus groups with incumbent workers who received training through the program.

Results of the WDP-CT Evaluation: Implications for WIA Implementation

The evaluation of the New Jersey CT program demonstrates that customized training can be an effective strategy for providing training for incumbent workers who have little access to other forms of training.

First, New Jersey successfully targeted the CT grants to small and medium size firms (with less than 1,000 employees) in the manufacturing industry that would not have otherwise invested in training. Two-thirds of CT grant funds and 88 percent of CT grants

were awarded to firms with less than 1,000 employees. In addition, nearly 80 percent of CT grants to firms and 86 percent of the total amount awarded to firms were awarded to those engaged in manufacturing.

Previous studies have demonstrated that firms with a small number of employees and firms in the manufacturing industry are less likely to provide formal training to their employees than are other firms (Frazis, Herz and Harrigan, 1995; Hollenbeck and Anderson, 1992, Lynch and Black, 1998). Firms contacted in the telephone survey confirmed this conclusion. Over half of the firms surveyed, 54 percent, reported that training would not have occurred without the receipt of the CT grant. An additional 31 percent of firms reported that training would have occurred even without the CT grant, but that it would have been on a smaller scale. Nearly all of the firms studied in the case studies reported that training would have occurred at the firm without the CT grant, but on a much smaller scale.

Second, the CT grant program gave individuals with lower levels of formal education an opportunity to receive training and upgrade their skill levels. The vast majority (82 percent) of firms that received a CT grant provided training primarily to individuals with a high school diploma or less. In addition, 85 percent of those individuals who received on-the-job training had not earned a college degree. Previous studies have concluded that workers with lower levels of formal education are less likely to receive workplace training from their employers than are individuals with higher levels of education (Frazis, Herz and Harrigan, 1995; Hollenbeck and Anderson, 1992, Lynch and Black, 1998). In fact, less than one-fourth (23 percent) of those individuals surveyed

who received on-the-job training funded by the CT program had participated in any type of training prior to the CT program.

Third, there is some evidence that suggests that the training provided by the firms was beneficial to the incumbent workers. Nearly nine in ten individuals who received on-the-job training reported in the telephone survey that they were satisfied with the training they received. Similar strong majorities said the training program was well run, was extremely valuable, had given them the skills they expected, and met all their needs. The earnings of individuals receiving on-the-job training increased in the period after they received training. Between the year before and two years after training began at the company, average quarterly wages of individuals receiving on-the-job training increased by 11 percent, when adjusting for inflation.

Finally, there is some evidence that suggests that the firms provided training to more employees and on a more frequent basis than they did before they participated in the CT program. Slightly less than 30 percent of the firms reported that, prior to the receipt of the CT grant, training was provided to all employees on a regular basis. Nearly two-thirds of firms reported that they provided training on a regular basis to all of their employees after the completion of the grant. Prior to receiving the grant, only 35 percent of firms had comprehensive strategies for upgrading the skills of their employees. After the grant, 62 percent of the firms adopted a long-term human resource development plan and currently provide training to all employees on a regular basis.

Individuals who received on-the-job training through the CT program were not usually served by the public workforce development system. Only one percent of respondents reported participating in training funded by the state or federal government

after receiving on-the-job training. This indicates that customized training programs can provide a unique opportunity to reach residents that normally would have a limited amount of interaction with the workforce development system and limited opportunities for training.

Lessons for WIA from WDPP

There are several clear lessons raised by the evaluation of the New Jersey Workforce Development Partnership program that are important in the discussion of the implications of the WIA.

Policy Implications

The evaluation of the ITG program clearly shows that even in a tight labor market, the dislocated worker faces an extremely difficult transition. It also demonstrates that training can be an effective strategy for assisting dislocated workers to find employment. In particular, women and individuals with lower levels of formal education benefit more from the ITG program than other individuals.

The evaluation of the CT program demonstrates that customized training, allowable under the Workforce Investment Act, can be an effective strategy for providing training to incumbent workers who have limited opportunity to upgrade their skills. However, special care must be made to adequately define the actual program goals. In particular, the program must clearly be designed to be an employment intervention rather than a economic development program.

Implications for Performance Measures and Evaluation

First, the reliance of the standards on administrative and UI wage records has several important caveats. Until the states are able to easily share UI records, the data will underreport employment and as a result underreport earnings. At the same time the data will over report job stability since the wage data are based on quarters and there are no controls from hours, employers, or weeks worked. Also, appropriate steps should be taken to understand the self-employment behavior of the participants.

Second, workers who participate in dislocated worker programs are inherently different than those who do not. Likewise, outcomes for education, race, and gender differences must be considered. No one intervention should be de facto considered appropriate for each demographic group.

Economic conditions are different for each state and change over time. At the same time each state also clearly has a different and changing employment market for workers who are likely to be dislocated workers. A comparison group is one way to measure how a training intervention fares holding similar characteristics constant. The comparison group can also be held as a benchmarking tool to see if performance goals are realistic.

This extends to the analysis of customer satisfaction surveys; groups that fare well report positive evaluations at higher rates than those who do not fare as well. The workers who do not fare well under the interventions and report negative satisfaction should be analyzed for possible lessons.

Finally, training benefits are not always realized in the limited time frame that is used by the WIA goals. Analyses should include evaluation of longer as well as shorter

time frames for wage recovery and employment rates. Measurement of wage recovery should be flexible, with evaluating wages in terms of quarters after filing for UI status as well as from the time of completing training. Surveys may be used to estimate the amount of time spent during training searching for employment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ashenfelter, Orley, 1978. "Estimating the Effects of Training Programs on Earnings." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 60, No. 1, February, pp. 47-57.

Ashenfelter, Orley and David Card. 1985. "Using the Longitudinal Structure of Earnings to Estimate the Effects of Training Programs." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 67, No.4, November, pp. 648-660.

Barnow, Burt, Glenn Cain, and Arthur Goldberger. 1980. "Issues in the Analysis of Selectivity Bias." *Evaluation Studies*, Vol. 5 No. 1 May, pp. 42-45.

Frazis, Harley J., Diane E. Herz, and Michael W. Harrigan. 1995. "Employer-Provided Training: Results from a New Survey." *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol. 118, No. 5, pp. 3-17.

Hollenbeck, Kevin and William Anderson. 1992. "Workplace Education Programs in Small and Medium-Sized Michigan Firms." Staff Working Paper 92-13. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

LaLonde, Robert. 1986. "Evaluating the Econometric Evaluations of Employment and Training Programs with Experimental Data." *American Economic Review*, Vol. 76, No. 4, September, pp.604-620.

Lynch, Lisa M. and Sandra E. Black. 1998. "Beyond the Incidence of Employer-Provided Training." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 64-81.

Table 1: Wage Recovery under WIA Measures

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

Full sample

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			WIA wage recovery	sample size	Comparison Group			WIA wage recovery
		ITG Mean	std dev				Comparison Mean	std dev		
4 quarters before ui claim	7169	\$7,007.06	4190.73		na	6889	\$ 6,823.05	4586.24		na
3 quarters before ui claim	7220	\$7,123.73	4281.93		99%	7174	\$ 6,968.45	4577.66		98%
2 quarters before ui claim	7207	\$7,144.65	4092.62		100%	7255	\$ 7,041.82	4397.09		100%
1 quarter before ui claim	7005	\$7,247.20	5142.48		101%	7109	\$ 7,135.61	5119.48		101%
quarter end training	2924	\$3,096.08	3522.14		72%	6483	\$ 5,921.33	7046.8		93%
1st quarter after training	4296	\$4,348.57	3450.08		52%	3924	\$ 4,646.32	6162.24		75%
2nd quarter after training	4598	\$5,158.22	3862.12		67%	4519	\$ 4,996.12	4534.51		69%
3rd quarter after training	4616	\$5,394.48	3443.65		74%	4937	\$ 5,254.21	4232.49		73%
4th quarter after training	4545	\$5,693.43	3703.27		78%	4953	\$ 5,310.00	4131.41		75%
5th quarter after training	4555	\$5,884.22	3716.9		81%	5025	\$ 5,662.16	4578.29		78%
6th quarter after training	4506	\$6,017.85	3701.61		83%	5115	\$ 5,891.79	4377.67		82%
7th quarter after training	4459	\$6,204.63	4077.67		86%	5135	\$ 5,972.52	4291.71		85%
8th quarter after training	4330	\$6,454.45	4244.28		89%	5046	\$ 5,907.27	4401.65		85%
9th quarter after training	3790	\$6,538.71	4322.64		91%	4723	\$ 6,114.16	4540.2		86%
10th quarter after training	3252	\$6,770.93	4350.91		93%	4335	\$ 6,396.70	4878.65		89%
11th quarter after training	2631	\$6,773.73	4240.82		95%	3935	\$ 6,554.25	5293.63		92%
12th quarter after training	2033	\$7,158.39	4604.07		98%	3459	\$ 6,504.14	4865.88		93%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

Full Sample

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			wage recovery	sample size	Comparison Group			wage recovery
		ITG Mean	std dev				Comparison Mean	std dev		
4 quarters before ui claim	7169	\$7,007.06	4190.7		na	6889	\$6,823.05	4586.2		na
3 quarters before ui claim	7220	\$7,123.73	4281.9		99%	7174	\$6,968.45	4577.7		98%
2 quarters before ui claim	7207	\$7,144.65	4092.6		100%	7255	\$7,041.82	4397.1		100%
1 quarter before ui claim	7005	\$7,247.20	5142.5		101%	7109	\$7,135.61	5119.5		101%
quarter of ui claim	6462	\$6,244.66	7154.4		95%	6483	\$5,921.33	7046.8		93%
1st quarter after ui claim	2221	\$3,587.54	5918.9		69%	3924	\$4,646.32	6162.2		75%
2nd quarter after ui claim	2564	\$3,262.78	3859.7		48%	4519	\$4,996.12	4534.5		69%
3rd quarter after ui claim	3605	\$3,982.02	3850.0		51%	4937	\$5,254.21	4232.5		73%
4th quarter after ui claim	4507	\$4,397.56	3549.2		59%	4953	\$5,310.00	4131.4		75%
5th quarter after ui claim	5086	\$4,808.29	3466.0		65%	5025	\$5,662.16	4578.3		78%
6th quarter after ui claim	5351	\$5,196.10	3705.3		70%	5115	\$5,891.79	4377.7		82%
7th quarter after ui claim	5406	\$5,555.66	3656.7		75%	5135	\$5,972.52	4291.7		85%
8th quarter after ui claim	5430	\$5,724.23	3816.7		79%	5046	\$5,907.27	4401.7		85%
9th quarter after ui claim	5346	\$5,951.36	3879.2		82%	4723	\$6,114.16	4540.2		86%
10th quarter after ui claim	5013	\$6,110.73	3858.4		85%	4335	\$6,396.70	4878.7		89%
11th quarter after ui claim	4553	\$6,268.54	4060.8		87%	3935	\$6,554.25	5293.6		92%
12th quarter after ui claim	4113	\$6,398.89	4380.1		89%	3459	\$6,504.14	4865.9		93%

Table 2: Employment Rates

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

Full Sample

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	ITG employment rate	std dev	sample size	Comparison group employment rate	std dev
4 quarters before ui claim	7651	94%	0.2430	7786	89%	0.3118
3 quarters before ui claim	7651	94%	0.2296	7786	92%	0.2674
2 quarters before ui claim	7651	94%	0.2336	7786	93%	0.2501
1 quarter before ui claim	7651	92%	0.2773	7786	91%	0.2795
quarter end training	7766	38%	0.4845	7786	84%	0.3651
1st quarter after training	7755	55%	0.4971	7786	51%	0.4964
2nd quarter after training	7749	59%	0.4912	7786	58%	0.4906
3rd quarter after training	7667	60%	0.4895	7786	63%	0.4790
4th quarter after training	7662	59%	0.4913	7786	63%	0.4782
5th quarter after training	7541	60%	0.4891	7786	64%	0.4752
6th quarter after training	7374	61%	0.4875	7786	65%	0.4736
7th quarter after training	6866	65%	0.4771	7786	65%	0.4724
8th quarter after training	6364	68%	0.4663	7786	64%	0.4754
9th quarter after training	5627	67%	0.4689	7322	64%	0.4762
10th quarter after training	4938	66%	0.4740	6792	64%	0.4797
11th quarter after training	3918	67%	0.4691	6220	63%	0.4816
12th quarter after training	3131	65%	0.4772	5560	62%	0.4857

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

Full Sample

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	7651	0.2430	94%	7786	0.3118	89%
3 quarters before ui claim	7651	0.2296	94%	7786	0.2674	92%
2 quarters before ui claim	7651	0.2336	94%	7786	0.2501	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	7651	0.2773	92%	7786	0.2795	91%
quarter of ui claim	7651	0.3614	85%	7786	0.3651	84%
1st quarter after ui claim	7651	0.4540	29%	7786	0.4964	51%
2nd quarter after ui claim	7651	0.4721	34%	7786	0.4906	58%
3rd quarter after ui claim	7651	0.4992	47%	7786	0.4790	63%
4th quarter after ui claim	7651	0.4920	59%	7786	0.4782	63%
5th quarter after ui claim	7651	0.4721	66%	7786	0.4752	64%
6th quarter after ui claim	7651	0.4586	70%	7786	0.4736	65%
7th quarter after ui claim	7651	0.4553	71%	7786	0.4724	65%
8th quarter after ui claim	7651	0.4539	71%	7786	0.4754	64%
9th quarter after ui claim	7608	0.4570	70%	7322	0.4762	64%
10th quarter after ui claim	7263	0.4624	69%	6792	0.4797	64%
11th quarter after ui claim	6756	0.4690	67%	6220	0.4816	63%
12th quarter after ui claim	6065	0.4672	68%	5560	0.4857	62%

Table 3: Wage Recovery Under WIA Measures by Gender

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

Males

mean wage— for employed	sample size	ITG Group			sample size	Comparison Group		
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery		Comparison group Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	2642	\$8,156.57	5336.0	na	2580	\$7,904.35	5360.7	na
3 quarters before ui claim	2668	\$8,238.89	5148.5	99%	2734	\$8,062.82	5260.5	99%
2 quarters before ui claim	2661	\$8,270.14	5056.9	100%	2796	\$8,050.66	5023.1	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	2603	\$8,195.84	5543.3	100%	2759	\$8,255.61	5870.4	101%
quarter end training	1051	\$3,745.57	4515.5	72%	2491	\$6,363.36	7383.8	91%
1st quarter after training	1552	\$5,071.30	4278.6	53%	1544	\$5,684.66	7445.6	75%
2nd quarter after training	1674	\$5,928.77	4933.7	67%	1805	\$6,180.77	5246.5	74%
3rd quarter after training	1695	\$6,176.69	4212.3	73%	1948	\$6,305.78	4889.8	77%
4th quarter after training	1664	\$6,574.11	4610.4	77%	1915	\$6,268.58	4944.8	78%
5th quarter after training	1671	\$6,820.93	4521.8	81%	1941	\$6,656.89	4697.7	80%
6th quarter after training	1663	\$6,913.34	4444.0	83%	1964	\$7,160.62	5240.9	86%
7th quarter after training	1635	\$7,182.38	4967.0	85%	1981	\$7,096.70	4968.4	88%
8th quarter after training	1582	\$7,493.62	5079.0	89%	1933	\$6,974.49	5272.0	87%
9th quarter after training	1384	\$7,738.51	5229.2	92%	1814	\$7,209.59	4992.2	88%
10th quarter after training	1208	\$8,019.79	5191.8	95%	1689	\$7,460.29	4991.0	91%
11th quarter after training	984	\$8,062.63	4928.5	97%	1546	\$7,713.55	5639.8	94%
12th quarter after training	781	\$8,515.02	5370.5	100%	1362	\$7,786.81	5604.1	96%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

Males

mean wage— for employed	sample size	ITG Group			sample size	Comparison Group		
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery		Comparison group Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	2642	\$8,156.57	5336.0	na	2580	\$7,904.35	5360.7	na
3 quarters before ui claim	2668	\$8,238.89	5148.5	99%	2734	\$8,062.82	5260.5	99%
2 quarters before ui claim	2661	\$8,270.14	5056.9	100%	2796	\$8,050.66	5023.1	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	2603	\$8,195.84	5543.3	100%	2759	\$8,255.61	5870.4	101%
quarter of ui claim	2405	\$6,950.79	8082.9	92%	2491	\$6,363.36	7383.8	91%
1st quarter after ui claim	878	\$4,299.16	6933.5	68%	1544	\$5,684.66	7445.6	75%
2nd quarter after ui claim	1032	\$4,197.30	4947.8	51%	1805	\$6,180.77	5246.5	74%
3rd quarter after ui claim	1373	\$4,825.09	4930.1	55%	1948	\$6,305.78	4889.8	77%
4th quarter after ui claim	1663	\$5,228.92	4359.6	61%	1915	\$6,268.58	4944.8	78%
5th quarter after ui claim	1817	\$5,689.18	4264.0	66%	1941	\$6,656.89	4697.7	80%
6th quarter after ui claim	1921	\$6,092.03	4663.6	71%	1964	\$7,160.62	5240.9	86%
7th quarter after ui claim	1941	\$6,460.02	4379.7	76%	1981	\$7,096.70	4968.4	88%
8th quarter after ui claim	1962	\$6,608.65	4608.3	79%	1933	\$6,974.49	5272.0	87%
9th quarter after ui claim	1900	\$6,988.68	4734.7	82%	1814	\$7,209.59	4992.2	88%
10th quarter after ui claim	1801	\$7,200.54	4685.5	86%	1689	\$7,460.29	4991.0	91%
11th quarter after ui claim	1614	\$7,421.89	4642.5	89%	1546	\$7,713.55	5639.8	94%
12th quarter after ui claim	1444	\$7,577.33	5431.5	91%	1362	\$7,786.81	5604.1	96%

Table 3 cont.

POST-TRAINING APPROACH
Women

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			sample size	Comparison Group		
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery		Comparison group Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	4526	\$6,337.58	3157.8	na	4309	\$6,224.98	3924.6	na
3 quarters before ui claim	4551	\$6,471.17	3520.1	99%	4440	\$6,352.79	3968.7	98%
2 quarters before ui claim	4545	\$6,486.75	3226.9	100%	4459	\$6,462.54	3834.6	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	4401	\$6,687.40	4803.3	102%	4350	\$6,485.13	4450.5	101%
quarter end training	1872	\$2,732.15	2751.0	73%	3992	\$5,666.44	6815.7	95%
1st quarter after training	2743	\$3,939.37	2797.6	51%	2380	\$4,026.54	5060.4	76%
2nd quarter after training	2923	\$4,716.89	2999.2	67%	2714	\$4,294.77	3818.8	65%
3rd quarter after training	2920	\$4,940.12	2808.8	75%	2989	\$4,640.19	3600.8	70%
4th quarter after training	2880	\$5,184.12	2942.7	78%	3038	\$4,767.97	3404.2	73%
5th quarter after training	2883	\$5,340.42	3029.1	81%	3084	\$5,096.22	4400.8	77%
6th quarter after training	2842	\$5,493.48	3070.7	84%	3151	\$5,191.28	3547.9	80%
7th quarter after training	2823	\$5,636.80	3331.5	86%	3154	\$5,347.84	3656.7	82%
8th quarter after training	2770	\$5,806.92	3569.7	88%	3113	\$5,308.04	3623.9	83%
9th quarter after training	2405	\$5,846.78	3522.2	90%	2909	\$5,484.09	4101.9	84%
10th quarter after training	2043	\$6,031.89	3568.8	92%	2646	\$5,760.90	4690.7	88%
11th quarter after training	1650	\$6,019.67	3539.0	93%	2389	\$5,844.40	4923.0	91%
12th quarter after training	1251	\$6,310.36	3819.7	95%	2097	\$5,699.53	4118.0	90%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH
Women

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			sample size	Comparison Group		
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery		Comparison group Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	4526	\$6,337.58	3157.8	na	4309	\$6,224.98	3924.6	na
3 quarters before ui claim	4551	\$6,471.17	3520.1	99%	4440	\$6,352.79	3968.7	98%
2 quarters before ui claim	4545	\$6,486.75	3226.9	100%	4459	\$6,462.54	3834.6	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	4401	\$6,687.40	4803.3	102%	4350	\$6,485.13	4450.5	101%
quarter of ui claim	4057	\$5,826.07	6507.1	97%	3992	\$5,666.44	6815.7	95%
1st quarter after ui claim	1343	\$3,122.31	5098.0	69%	2380	\$4,026.54	5060.4	76%
2nd quarter after ui claim	1532	\$2,633.25	2732.8	44%	2714	\$4,294.77	3818.8	65%
3rd quarter after ui claim	2232	\$3,463.41	2879.3	47%	2989	\$4,640.19	3600.8	70%
4th quarter after ui claim	2843	\$3,912.19	2866.1	57%	3038	\$4,767.97	3404.2	73%
5th quarter after ui claim	3268	\$4,318.44	2814.3	64%	3084	\$5,096.22	4400.8	77%
6th quarter after ui claim	3429	\$4,694.16	2922.9	70%	3151	\$5,191.28	3547.9	80%
7th quarter after ui claim	3464	\$5,048.71	3067.4	75%	3154	\$5,347.84	3656.7	82%
8th quarter after ui claim	3500	\$5,174.10	3204.4	79%	3113	\$5,308.04	3623.9	83%
9th quarter after ui claim	3445	\$5,378.53	3173.3	81%	2909	\$5,484.09	4101.9	84%
10th quarter after ui claim	3211	\$5,499.17	3145.4	84%	2646	\$5,760.90	4690.7	88%
11th quarter after ui claim	2932	\$5,661.69	3532.0	86%	2389	\$5,844.40	4923.0	91%
12th quarter after ui claim	2668	\$5,760.60	3529.6	88%	2097	\$5,699.53	4118.0	90%

Table 4: Wage Recovery by Race**POST-TRAINING APPROACH**

White

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			sample size	Comparison Group	
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery		Comparison group Mean	std dev
4 quarters before ui claim	4881	\$7,465.78	4428.46	na	4779	\$7,346.00	4916.6
3 quarters before ui claim	4904	\$7,603.33	4601.31	99%	4966	\$7,476.05	4822.36
2 quarters before ui claim	4892	\$7,606.96	4404.4	100%	4987	\$7,537.82	4604.47
1 quarter before ui claim	4736	\$7,729.77	5431.2	101%	4881	\$7,686.77	5250.24
quarter end training	1983	\$3,307.75	3786.08	73%	4461	\$6,570.81	7757.51
1st quarter after training	2918	\$4,630.58	3649.25	52%	2728	\$5,145.78	7003.74
2nd quarter after training	3124	\$5,434.33	3699.07	66%	3128	\$5,360.10	4665.11
3rd quarter after training	3146	\$5,660.86	3535.77	73%	3400	\$5,669.62	4388.44
4th quarter after training	3082	\$5,993.06	3815.93	77%	3396	\$5,770.81	4450.65
5th quarter after training	3085	\$6,171.74	3817.19	80%	3437	\$6,133.06	4979.19
6th quarter after training	3033	\$6,299.23	3810.09	82%	3506	\$6,364.80	4738.71
7th quarter after training	3009	\$6,545.91	4354.94	84%	3521	\$6,451.41	4584.74
8th quarter after training	2937	\$6,758.38	4569.71	87%	3446	\$6,382.42	4764.52
9th quarter after training	2541	\$6,853.70	4516.01	89%	3231	\$6,657.68	4964.08
10th quarter after training	2194	\$7,114.19	4499.27	92%	2987	\$6,895.72	5145.3
11th quarter after training	1779	\$7,132.07	4337.8	94%	2740	\$7,008.67	5232.42
12th quarter after training	1400	\$7,478.93	4705.89	96%	2413	\$6,971.91	5224.1

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

White

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			sample size	Comparison Group	
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery		Comparison group Mean	std dev
4 quarters before ui claim	4881	\$7,465.78	4428.5	na	4779	\$7,346.00	4916.6
3 quarters before ui claim	4904	\$7,603.33	4601.3	99%	4966	\$7,476.05	4822.4
2 quarters before ui claim	4892	\$7,606.96	4404.4	100%	4987	\$7,537.82	4604.5
1 quarter before ui claim	4736	\$7,729.77	5431.2	101%	4881	\$7,686.77	5250.2
quarter of ui claim	4384	\$6,671.68	7518.0	95%	4461	\$6,570.81	7757.5
1st quarter after ui claim	1513	\$3,945.32	6472.6	70%	2728	\$5,145.78	7003.7
2nd quarter after ui claim	1748	\$3,464.27	4015.9	49%	3128	\$5,360.10	4665.1
3rd quarter after ui claim	2459	\$4,233.47	3893.5	51%	3400	\$5,669.62	4388.4
4th quarter after ui claim	3062	\$4,670.70	3699.9	59%	3396	\$5,770.81	4450.7
5th quarter after ui claim	3468	\$5,057.45	3625.6	64%	3437	\$6,133.06	4979.2
6th quarter after ui claim	3621	\$5,431.50	3655.3	69%	3506	\$6,364.80	4738.7
7th quarter after ui claim	3658	\$5,781.50	3812.8	74%	3521	\$6,451.41	4584.7
8th quarter after ui claim	3691	\$5,916.57	3868.5	77%	3446	\$6,382.42	4764.5
9th quarter after ui claim	3613	\$6,237.16	4002.9	80%	3231	\$6,657.68	4964.1
10th quarter after ui claim	3387	\$6,349.92	3984.2	83%	2987	\$6,895.72	5145.3
11th quarter after ui claim	3087	\$6,580.91	4270.6	85%	2740	\$7,008.67	5232.4
12th quarter after ui claim	2791	\$6,714.05	4654.5	87%	2413	\$6,971.91	5224.1

Table 4 cont.

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

African-American

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery	sample size	Comparison group Mean	std dev
4 quarters before ui claim	1318	\$6,173.94	3534.9	na	1234	\$5,839.18	3666.8
3 quarters before ui claim	1337	\$6,166.87	3301.6	100%	1279	\$6,028.38	3909.5
2 quarters before ui claim	1334	\$6,173.89	2990.7	100%	1311	\$6,024.80	3367.1
1 quarter before ui claim	1310	\$6,356.20	4834.6	102%	1280	\$6,059.98	4810.1
quarter end training	571	\$2,678.06	2902.4	73%	1154	\$4,662.16	5091.0
1st quarter after training	791	\$3,760.28	2929.6	52%	720	\$3,442.64	3095.3
2nd quarter after training	849	\$4,406.23	4223.7	66%	808	\$4,130.84	4350.2
3rd quarter after training	842	\$4,656.04	2934.1	73%	885	\$4,430.04	4174.8
4th quarter after training	842	\$4,872.47	3067.4	77%	904	\$4,337.48	3255.5
5th quarter after training	840	\$5,167.72	3308.8	81%	923	\$4,618.75	3526.8
6th quarter after training	857	\$5,221.38	3078.0	84%	935	\$4,861.82	3410.8
7th quarter after training	839	\$5,369.18	3212.2	86%	945	\$4,873.18	3626.4
8th quarter after training	805	\$5,604.33	3240.9	89%	946	\$4,829.51	3405.4
9th quarter after training	708	\$5,712.17	3683.0	92%	872	\$4,875.18	3234.7
10th quarter after training	602	\$5,896.64	4058.5	94%	775	\$5,233.51	4529.6
11th quarter after training	486	\$5,931.15	4044.3	96%	690	\$5,587.16	6321.5
12th quarter after training	373	\$6,173.55	4627.5	98%	602	\$5,330.15	3943.0

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

African-American

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery	sample size	Comparison group Mean	std dev
4 quarters before ui claim	1318	\$6,173.94	3534.9	na	1234	\$5,839.18	3666.8
3 quarters before ui claim	1337	\$6,166.87	3301.6	100%	1279	\$6,028.38	3909.5
2 quarters before ui claim	1334	\$6,173.89	2990.7	100%	1311	\$6,024.80	3367.1
1 quarter before ui claim	1310	\$6,356.20	4834.6	102%	1280	\$6,059.98	4810.1
quarter of ui claim	1210	\$5,589.43	6568.2	97%	1154	\$4,662.16	5091.0
1st quarter after ui claim	455	\$2,976.75	4358.5	69%	720	\$3,442.64	3095.3
2nd quarter after ui claim	519	\$2,685.75	2757.0	46%	808	\$4,130.84	4350.2
3rd quarter after ui claim	706	\$3,276.35	2822.8	48%	885	\$4,430.04	4174.8
4th quarter after ui claim	854	\$3,697.04	2850.0	57%	904	\$4,337.48	3255.5
5th quarter after ui claim	942	\$4,173.68	2822.3	64%	923	\$4,618.75	3526.8
6th quarter after ui claim	1009	\$4,672.57	4102.2	72%	935	\$4,861.82	3410.8
7th quarter after ui claim	1010	\$4,998.14	3101.4	78%	945	\$4,873.18	3626.4
8th quarter after ui claim	1040	\$5,075.03	3392.2	82%	946	\$4,829.51	3405.4
9th quarter after ui claim	1009	\$5,220.30	3238.1	83%	872	\$4,875.18	3234.7
10th quarter after ui claim	934	\$5,520.01	3288.4	87%	775	\$5,233.51	4529.6
11th quarter after ui claim	841	\$5,508.19	3243.5	89%	690	\$5,587.16	6321.5
12th quarter after ui claim	754	\$5,679.84	3523.9	91%	602	\$5,330.15	3943.0

Table 4 cont.

POST-TRAINING APPROACH
Hispanic

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			sample size	Comparison Group	
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery		Comparison group Mean	std dev
4 quarters before ui claim	778	\$5,441.56	2786.6	na	671	\$5,149.83	3017.6
3 quarters before ui claim	789	\$5,653.96	2774.7	97%	719	\$5,258.66	3293.8
2 quarters before ui claim	789	\$5,799.29	2804.4	100%	738	\$5,641.23	4200.5
1 quarter before ui claim	774	\$5,645.53	2771.2	100%	737	\$5,477.65	4175.6
quarter end training	304	\$2,290.38	2188.3	69%	676	\$3,871.30	3616.0
1st quarter after training	471	\$3,565.27	2582.6	51%	372	\$3,401.18	3622.7
2nd quarter after training	501	\$4,505.34	3926.5	70%	461	\$4,003.54	2896.6
3rd quarter after training	503	\$4,667.60	2826.4	80%	515	\$4,089.59	2896.8
4th quarter after training	494	\$4,930.02	2910.4	84%	510	\$4,132.72	2831.4
5th quarter after training	498	\$5,126.14	3087.8	88%	523	\$4,531.07	3097.5
6th quarter after training	485	\$5,356.11	3172.1	92%	530	\$4,725.14	3019.4
7th quarter after training	487	\$5,369.81	3179.4	94%	522	\$4,794.59	2848.4
8th quarter after training	493	\$5,662.68	3453.0	96%	510	\$4,838.64	3091.7
9th quarter after training	437	\$5,849.89	3819.2	101%	480	\$4,868.82	3115.6
10th quarter after training	360	\$5,876.66	3428.6	102%	441	\$5,218.79	3318.6
11th quarter after training	301	\$5,839.40	3171.5	102%	393	\$5,253.85	3515.5
12th quarter after training	208	\$6,335.42	3127.2	106%	336	\$5,336.31	3343.1

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH
Hispanic

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			sample size	Comparison Group	
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery		Comparison group Mean	std dev
4 quarters before ui claim	778	\$5,441.56	2786.6	na	671	\$5,149.83	3017.6
3 quarters before ui claim	789	\$5,653.96	2774.7	97%	719	\$5,258.66	3293.8
2 quarters before ui claim	789	\$5,799.29	2804.4	100%	738	\$5,641.23	4200.5
1 quarter before ui claim	774	\$5,645.53	2771.2	100%	737	\$5,477.65	4175.6
quarter of ui claim	699	\$4,533.40	5280.9	89%	676	\$3,871.30	3616.0
1st quarter after ui claim	191	\$2,062.95	2922.1	58%	372	\$3,401.18	3622.7
2nd quarter after ui claim	235	\$2,452.07	2800.4	39%	461	\$4,003.54	2896.6
3rd quarter after ui claim	354	\$3,235.27	2516.7	50%	515	\$4,089.59	2896.8
4th quarter after ui claim	480	\$3,708.61	2871.1	61%	510	\$4,132.72	2831.4
5th quarter after ui claim	548	\$4,066.80	2764.9	68%	523	\$4,531.07	3097.5
6th quarter after ui claim	582	\$4,465.64	2782.0	74%	530	\$4,725.14	3019.4
7th quarter after ui claim	593	\$4,856.71	2916.4	81%	522	\$4,794.59	2848.4
8th quarter after ui claim	589	\$5,136.83	3904.9	87%	510	\$4,838.64	3091.7
9th quarter after ui claim	583	\$5,145.80	3070.2	90%	480	\$4,868.82	3115.6
10th quarter after ui claim	560	\$5,440.74	3077.7	92%	441	\$5,218.79	3318.6
11th quarter after ui claim	505	\$5,535.51	3411.9	96%	393	\$5,253.85	3515.5
12th quarter after ui claim	466	\$5,579.79	3649.3	97%	336	\$5,336.31	3343.1

Table 5: Wage Recovery by Educational Level

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

Less than high school

mean wage— for employed	sample size	ITG Group			Comparison Group			
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery	sample size	Comparison Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	424	\$5,403.30	3094.0	na	368	\$5,216.16	3737.0	na
3 quarters before ui claim	425	\$5,663.36	3003.3	97%	392	\$5,176.09	3864.5	99%
2 quarters before ui claim	428	\$5,746.51	3013.2	100%	404	\$5,372.72	3128.8	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	410	\$5,487.00	2990.6	98%	400	\$5,486.91	4592.1	103%
quarter end training	158	\$2,209.00	2291.0	67%	357	\$3,860.56	4430.5	89%
1st quarter after training	245	\$3,654.98	3040.8	51%	209	\$3,513.76	3855.1	70%
2nd quarter after training	257	\$4,368.51	3006.9	70%	236	\$4,141.16	3506.2	73%
3rd quarter after training	256	\$4,564.20	2763.8	78%	247	\$4,647.70	5656.6	83%
4th quarter after training	255	\$4,765.70	2839.3	82%	255	\$3,898.92	2985.5	81%
5th quarter after training	247	\$5,049.03	3205.1	86%	254	\$4,294.59	3587.0	78%
6th quarter after training	252	\$4,816.78	2887.3	86%	262	\$4,306.03	3325.2	82%
7th quarter after training	258	\$4,846.06	2753.3	85%	250	\$4,468.69	3444.9	83%
8th quarter after training	248	\$5,295.82	5357.6	89%	245	\$3,948.50	2600.7	80%
9th quarter after training	215	\$5,215.72	3061.0	92%	231	\$4,417.70	3580.2	79%
10th quarter after training	179	\$5,340.15	2806.1	93%	219	\$4,498.11	3783.0	85%
11th quarter after training	148	\$5,324.30	2778.3	93%	194	\$4,311.64	3544.1	84%
12th quarter after training	115	\$5,402.62	2892.8	94%	167	\$4,426.20	3301.1	83%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

Less than high school

mean wage— for employed	sample size	ITG Group			Comparison Group			
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery	sample size	Comparison Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	424	\$5,403.30	3094.0	na	368	\$5,216.16	3737.0	na
3 quarters before ui claim	425	\$5,663.36	3003.3	97%	392	\$5,176.09	3864.5	99%
2 quarters before ui claim	428	\$5,746.51	3013.2	100%	404	\$5,372.72	3128.8	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	410	\$5,487.00	2990.6	98%	400	\$5,486.91	4592.1	103%
quarter of ui claim	371	\$4,403.69	5743.3	87%	357	\$3,860.56	4430.5	89%
1st quarter after ui claim	102	\$2,111.31	2827.8	57%	209	\$3,513.76	3855.1	70%
2nd quarter after ui claim	148	\$2,426.28	2717.8	40%	236	\$4,141.16	3506.2	73%
3rd quarter after ui claim	218	\$3,540.97	3031.3	52%	247	\$4,647.70	5656.6	83%
4th quarter after ui claim	264	\$3,703.48	2793.4	63%	255	\$3,898.92	2985.5	81%
5th quarter after ui claim	297	\$4,145.30	3004.3	69%	254	\$4,294.59	3587.0	78%
6th quarter after ui claim	295	\$4,582.53	3244.4	76%	262	\$4,306.03	3325.2	82%
7th quarter after ui claim	301	\$4,659.68	2877.0	81%	250	\$4,468.69	3444.9	83%
8th quarter after ui claim	302	\$4,588.73	3004.5	81%	245	\$3,948.50	2600.7	80%
9th quarter after ui claim	283	\$4,539.85	2826.8	80%	231	\$4,417.70	3580.2	79%
10th quarter after ui claim	257	\$5,095.45	3158.8	84%	219	\$4,498.11	3783.0	85%
11th quarter after ui claim	240	\$4,995.02	3082.9	88%	194	\$4,311.64	3544.1	84%
12th quarter after ui claim	215	\$5,520.46	5699.1	92%	167	\$4,426.20	3301.1	83%

Table 5 cont.

POST-TRAINING APPROACH
High school

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			Comparison Group			
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery	sample size	Comparison Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	3173	\$6,327.67	3333.3	na	3092	\$6,001.08	3703.4	na
3 quarters before ui claim	3196	\$6,396.62	3372.4	99%	3216	\$6,139.91	3567.4	98%
2 quarters before ui claim	3182	\$6,409.61	3248.9	100%	3236	\$6,262.37	3679.7	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	3100	\$6,462.18	3868.6	101%	3169	\$6,280.18	4235.1	101%
quarter end training	1323	\$2,773.80	2700.2	72%	2898	\$5,255.70	6422.9	93%
1st quarter after training	1967	\$3,997.15	2956.0	53%	1740	\$4,106.31	4439.7	75%
2nd quarter after training	2111	\$4,612.63	2942.4	67%	2024	\$4,331.58	3565.2	68%
3rd quarter after training	2114	\$4,905.71	2896.0	74%	2185	\$4,630.30	3612.6	72%
4th quarter after training	2084	\$5,143.60	3208.1	78%	2187	\$4,624.56	3539.4	75%
5th quarter after training	2094	\$5,306.02	2992.5	82%	2238	\$4,924.85	3951.3	77%
6th quarter after training	2075	\$5,476.73	3059.6	84%	2285	\$5,192.91	3821.0	82%
7th quarter after training	2046	\$5,703.11	3858.5	87%	2275	\$5,233.66	3432.1	84%
8th quarter after training	1993	\$5,787.69	3707.7	90%	2237	\$5,133.55	3549.6	84%
9th quarter after training	1756	\$5,819.81	3305.4	91%	2079	\$5,325.29	3841.4	84%
10th quarter after training	1515	\$6,058.76	3580.4	93%	1914	\$5,556.84	4222.9	88%
11th quarter after training	1219	\$6,138.88	3806.7	95%	1749	\$5,792.06	4822.5	92%
12th quarter after training	942	\$6,271.16	3503.6	97%	1525	\$5,512.07	3702.6	91%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH
High school

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			Comparison Group			
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery	sample size	Comparison Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	3173	\$6,327.67	3333.3	na	3092	\$6,001.08	3703.4	na
3 quarters before ui claim	3196	\$6,396.62	3372.4	99%	3216	\$6,139.91	3567.4	98%
2 quarters before ui claim	3182	\$6,409.61	3248.9	100%	3236	\$6,262.37	3679.7	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	3100	\$6,462.18	3868.6	101%	3169	\$6,280.18	4235.1	101%
quarter of ui claim	2880	\$5,594.24	6320.1	94%	2898	\$5,255.70	6422.9	93%
1st quarter after ui claim	963	\$3,037.98	4247.0	67%	1740	\$4,106.31	4439.7	75%
2nd quarter after ui claim	1143	\$3,019.54	3148.2	47%	2024	\$4,331.58	3565.2	68%
3rd quarter after ui claim	1629	\$3,654.39	3095.7	52%	2185	\$4,630.30	3612.6	72%
4th quarter after ui claim	2045	\$4,037.45	2966.8	60%	2187	\$4,624.56	3539.4	75%
5th quarter after ui claim	2325	\$4,375.14	2914.9	66%	2238	\$4,924.85	3951.3	77%
6th quarter after ui claim	2424	\$4,804.85	3006.9	72%	2285	\$5,192.91	3821.0	82%
7th quarter after ui claim	2463	\$5,110.38	3217.5	77%	2275	\$5,233.66	3432.1	84%
8th quarter after ui claim	2468	\$5,180.70	3156.7	80%	2237	\$5,133.55	3549.6	84%
9th quarter after ui claim	2439	\$5,476.15	3379.2	83%	2079	\$5,325.29	3841.4	84%
10th quarter after ui claim	2280	\$5,594.52	3167.8	86%	1914	\$5,556.84	4222.9	88%
11th quarter after ui claim	2079	\$5,647.35	3576.5	88%	1749	\$5,792.06	4822.5	92%
12th quarter after ui claim	1863	\$5,771.12	3666.2	89%	1525	\$5,512.07	3702.6	91%

Table 5 cont.

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

Some college

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			sample size	Comparison Group		
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery		Comparison group Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	2297	\$6,889.19	3469.03	na	2308	\$6,696.06	4108.15	na
3 quarters before ui claim	2320	\$7,024.07	3984.92	99%	2400	\$6,920.24	4183.25	98%
2 quarters before ui claim	2308	\$6,975.22	3443.23	100%	2422	\$6,944.68	4053.13	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	2238	\$7,077.06	4715.66	100%	2374	\$6,977.66	4827.95	100%
quarter end training	945	\$2,898.13	3015.82	71%	2177	\$5,573.97	6288.81	91%
1st quarter after training	1376	\$4,267.30	3077.01	51%	1325	\$4,343.18	4938.14	72%
2nd quarter after training	1464	\$5,215.10	4250.66	68%	1531	\$4,758.54	4293	66%
3rd quarter after training	1475	\$5,354.74	3073.82	75%	1696	\$5,059.44	3715.35	71%
4th quarter after training	1453	\$5,634.94	3244.07	78%	1706	\$5,184.09	3570.58	74%
5th quarter after training	1439	\$5,876.99	3368.65	82%	1718	\$5,633.33	3914.06	78%
6th quarter after training	1423	\$5,995.57	3393.37	85%	1745	\$5,759.05	3745.41	82%
7th quarter after training	1415	\$6,079.23	3577.72	86%	1767	\$5,872.22	3761.75	84%
8th quarter after training	1376	\$6,464.70	3593.65	90%	1743	\$5,974.17	3871.87	85%
9th quarter after training	1177	\$6,555.73	3898.47	93%	1629	\$6,104.95	3971.53	87%
10th quarter after training	1021	\$6,847.24	4031.83	96%	1478	\$6,334.37	3897.78	90%
11th quarter after training	841	\$6,746.68	3826.16	97%	1337	\$6,612.44	5024.36	93%
12th quarter after training	636	\$7,297.79	4616.25	100%	1174	\$6,553.79	4236.86	95%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

Some college

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			sample size	Comparison Group		
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery		Comparison group Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	2297	\$6,889.19	3469.0	na	2308	\$6,696.06	4108.2	na
3 quarters before ui claim	2320	\$7,024.07	3984.9	99%	2400	\$6,920.24	4183.3	98%
2 quarters before ui claim	2308	\$6,975.22	3443.2	100%	2422	\$6,944.68	4053.1	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	2238	\$7,077.06	4715.7	100%	2374	\$6,977.66	4828.0	100%
quarter of ui claim	2052	\$6,125.53	6773.7	94%	2177	\$5,573.97	6288.8	91%
1st quarter after ui claim	691	\$3,177.58	4458.0	66%	1325	\$4,343.18	4938.1	72%
2nd quarter after ui claim	791	\$2,982.06	3170.9	44%	1531	\$4,758.54	4293.0	66%
3rd quarter after ui claim	1119	\$3,709.90	3071.9	48%	1696	\$5,059.44	3715.4	71%
4th quarter after ui claim	1432	\$4,223.52	3259.2	57%	1706	\$5,184.09	3570.6	74%
5th quarter after ui claim	1634	\$4,718.70	3107.2	64%	1718	\$5,633.33	3914.1	78%
6th quarter after ui claim	1764	\$5,059.83	3785.0	70%	1745	\$5,759.05	3745.4	82%
7th quarter after ui claim	1752	\$5,500.11	3336.9	75%	1767	\$5,872.22	3761.8	84%
8th quarter after ui claim	1791	\$5,640.85	3685.2	80%	1743	\$5,974.17	3871.9	85%
9th quarter after ui claim	1747	\$5,843.80	3494.7	82%	1629	\$6,104.95	3971.5	87%
10th quarter after ui claim	1656	\$5,971.69	3525.2	84%	1478	\$6,334.37	3897.8	90%
11th quarter after ui claim	1490	\$6,332.33	3593.5	88%	1337	\$6,612.44	5024.4	93%
12th quarter after ui claim	1377	\$6,405.98	3925.5	91%	1174	\$6,553.79	4236.9	95%

Table 5 cont.

POST-TRAINING APPROACH
College

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			Comparison Group			
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery	sample size	Comparison Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	1275	\$9,443.49	6189.5	na	1121	\$9,714.07	6373.6	na
3 quarters before ui claim	1279	\$9,606.71	5925.2	99%	1166	\$9,852.66	6425.3	100%
2 quarters before ui claim	1289	\$9,726.78	5889.6	100%	1193	\$9,811.94	5804.4	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	1257	\$10,060.25	7584.2	102%	1166	\$10,223.03	6602.9	102%
quarter end training	498	\$4,609.35	5633.6	76%	1051	\$8,979.39	9553.0	98%
1st quarter after training	708	\$5,722.90	4898.3	53%	650	\$6,930.96	10738.4	81%
2nd quarter after training	766	\$6,818.02	4937.5	65%	728	\$7,584.11	6430.8	74%
3rd quarter after training	771	\$7,086.31	4867.3	72%	809	\$7,508.12	5397.8	77%
4th quarter after training	753	\$7,642.16	5136.1	76%	805	\$7,898.52	5704.9	78%
5th quarter after training	775	\$7,726.10	5310.2	79%	815	\$8,180.18	6456.3	82%
6th quarter after training	756	\$7,945.33	5155.1	81%	823	\$8,735.31	5949.9	86%
7th quarter after training	740	\$8,304.71	5117.7	84%	843	\$8,671.33	6159.9	89%
8th quarter after training	736	\$8,429.51	5547.4	87%	821	\$8,499.07	6433.1	87%
9th quarter after training	642	\$8,916.92	6469.7	90%	784	\$8,656.67	6269.3	87%
10th quarter after training	537	\$9,111.99	6118.9	93%	724	\$9,131.54	7005.7	90%
11th quarter after training	427	\$9,201.84	5460.8	95%	655	\$8,925.29	6464.9	92%
12th quarter after training	340	\$9,949.63	6258.7	99%	593	\$9,209.57	7225.4	92%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH
College

mean wage-- for employed	sample size	ITG Group			Comparison Group			
		ITG mean	std dev	wage recovery	sample size	Comparison Mean	std dev	wage recovery
4 quarters before ui claim	1275	\$9,443.49	6189.5	na	1121	\$9,714.07	6373.6	na
3 quarters before ui claim	1279	\$9,606.71	5925.2	99%	1166	\$9,852.66	6425.3	100%
2 quarters before ui claim	1289	\$9,726.78	5889.6	100%	1193	\$9,811.94	5804.4	100%
1 quarter before ui claim	1257	\$10,060.25	7584.2	102%	1166	\$10,223.03	6602.9	102%
quarter of ui claim	1159	\$8,661.11	9298.9	97%	1051	\$8,979.39	9553.0	98%
1st quarter after ui claim	465	\$5,658.67	9657.7	74%	650	\$6,930.96	10738.4	81%
2nd quarter after ui claim	482	\$4,557.11	5908.7	53%	728	\$7,584.11	6430.8	74%
3rd quarter after ui claim	639	\$5,444.24	6082.9	52%	809	\$7,508.12	5397.8	77%
4th quarter after ui claim	766	\$5,923.52	5022.5	59%	805	\$7,898.52	5704.9	78%
5th quarter after ui claim	830	\$6,435.30	4927.3	64%	815	\$8,180.18	6456.3	82%
6th quarter after ui claim	868	\$6,774.20	4864.3	68%	823	\$8,735.31	5949.9	86%
7th quarter after ui claim	890	\$7,200.27	4936.3	72%	843	\$8,671.33	6159.9	89%
8th quarter after ui claim	902	\$7,547.70	5206.9	76%	821	\$8,499.07	6433.1	87%
9th quarter after ui claim	877	\$7,942.71	5277.8	80%	784	\$8,656.67	6269.3	87%
10th quarter after ui claim	820	\$8,145.03	5450.0	83%	724	\$9,131.54	7005.7	90%
11th quarter after ui claim	738	\$8,421.09	5448.3	86%	655	\$8,925.29	6464.9	92%
12th quarter after ui claim	658	\$8,448.49	5792.6	87%	593	\$9,209.57	7225.4	92%

Table 6: Employment Rates by Gender

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

Males

Males		ITG Group		Comparison Group		
employment rate	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	2882	0.2763	92%	3059	0.3424	85%
3 quarters before ui claim	2882	0.2605	93%	3059	0.2987	89%
2 quarters before ui claim	2882	0.2656	92%	3059	0.2688	92%
1 quarter before ui claim	2882	0.2938	90%	3059	0.2856	90%
quarter end training	2946	0.4791	36%	3059	0.3652	83%
1st quarter after training	2940	0.4993	53%	3059	0.4827	51%
2nd quarter after training	2939	0.4952	57%	3059	0.4770	58%
3rd quarter after training	2911	0.4932	58%	3059	0.4670	63%
4th quarter after training	2908	0.4948	57%	3059	0.4693	62%
5th quarter after training	2869	0.4932	58%	3059	0.4664	63%
6th quarter after training	2796	0.4910	59%	3059	0.4681	62%
7th quarter after training	2605	0.4834	63%	3059	0.4665	63%
8th quarter after training	2447	0.4796	64%	3059	0.4679	62%
9th quarter after training	2168	0.4806	64%	2883	0.4684	63%
10th quarter after training	1921	0.4831	63%	2710	0.4722	62%
11th quarter after training	1538	0.4798	64%	2516	0.4772	62%
12th quarter after training	1254	0.4847	62%	2251	0.4838	61%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

Males

Males	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
employment rate	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	2882	0.2763461	92%	3059	0.3424386	85%
3 quarters before ui claim	2882	0.2605311	93%	3059	0.2986656	89%
2 quarters before ui claim	2882	0.2655808	92%	3059	0.2688213	92%
1 quarter before ui claim	2882	0.293845	90%	3059	0.285612	90%
quarter of ui claim	2882	0.3695038	84%	3059	0.3652318	83%
1st quarter after ui claim	2882	0.4606327	31%	3059	0.4826509	51%
2nd quarter after ui claim	2882	0.4795204	36%	3059	0.4770035	58%
3rd quarter after ui claim	2882	0.4995459	48%	3059	0.4670104	63%
4th quarter after ui claim	2882	0.4941165	58%	3059	0.4693068	62%
5th quarter after ui claim	2882	0.4826687	63%	3059	0.4663661	63%
6th quarter after ui claim	2882	0.4715272	67%	3059	0.4680724	62%
7th quarter after ui claim	2882	0.4688889	67%	3059	0.4665068	63%
8th quarter after ui claim	2882	0.4675874	68%	3059	0.4679497	62%
9th quarter after ui claim	2858	0.4718978	67%	2883	0.4684333	63%
10th quarter after ui claim	2703	0.4716224	67%	2710	0.4722101	62%
11th quarter after ui claim	2521	0.4800304	64%	2516	0.4771627	62%
12th quarter after ui claim	2249	0.4795	64%	2251	0.4838129	61%

Table 6 Cont.
POST-TRAINING APPROACH
Females

employment rate	sample size	std dev	ITG Group		Comparison Group	
			ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	4768	0.2195	95%	4727	0.2880	91%
3 quarters before ui claim	4768	0.2080	95%	4727	0.2436	94%
2 quarters before ui claim	4768	0.2112	95%	4727	0.2366	94%
1 quarter before ui claim	4768	0.2666	92%	4727	0.2753	92%
quarter end training	4818	0.4875	39%	4727	0.3648	85%
1st quarter after training	4813	0.4951	57%	4727	0.5052	51%
2nd quarter after training	4808	0.4883	61%	4727	0.4993	58%
3rd quarter after training	4754	0.4868	61%	4727	0.4867	63%
4th quarter after training	4752	0.4887	61%	4727	0.4835	64%
5th quarter after training	4670	0.4861	62%	4727	0.4806	65%
6th quarter after training	4576	0.4852	62%	4727	0.4764	67%
7th quarter after training	4260	0.4729	66%	4727	0.4756	67%
8th quarter after training	3916	0.4562	70%	4727	0.4798	66%
9th quarter after training	3458	0.4601	70%	4439	0.4811	65%
10th quarter after training	3016	0.4673	68%	4082	0.4845	64%
11th quarter after training	2379	0.4609	69%	3704	0.4844	64%
12th quarter after training	1876	0.4715	67%	3309	0.4868	63%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH
Females

employment rate	sample size	std dev	ITG Group		Comparison Group	
			ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	4768	0.2195	95%	4727	0.2880	91%
3 quarters before ui claim	4768	0.2080	95%	4727	0.2436	94%
2 quarters before ui claim	4768	0.2112	95%	4727	0.2366	94%
1 quarter before ui claim	4768	0.2666	92%	4727	0.2753	92%
quarter of ui claim	4768	0.3562	85%	4727	0.3648	85%
1st quarter after ui claim	4768	0.4499	28%	4727	0.5052	51%
2nd quarter after ui claim	4768	0.4670	32%	4727	0.4993	58%
3rd quarter after ui claim	4768	0.4990	47%	4727	0.4867	63%
4th quarter after ui claim	4768	0.4907	60%	4727	0.4835	64%
5th quarter after ui claim	4768	0.4644	69%	4727	0.4806	65%
6th quarter after ui claim	4768	0.4495	72%	4727	0.4764	67%
7th quarter after ui claim	4768	0.4458	73%	4727	0.4756	67%
8th quarter after ui claim	4768	0.4444	73%	4727	0.4798	66%
9th quarter after ui claim	4749	0.4464	73%	4439	0.4811	65%
10th quarter after ui claim	4559	0.4563	70%	4082	0.4845	64%
11th quarter after ui claim	4234	0.4613	69%	3704	0.4844	64%
12th quarter after ui claim	3815	0.4585	70%	3309	0.4868	63%

Table 7: Employment Rates by Race

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

White

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	5163	0.2273	95%	5349	0.2980	90%
3 quarters before ui claim	5163	0.2171	95%	5349	0.2521	93%
2 quarters before ui claim	5163	0.2226	95%	5349	0.2465	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	5163	0.2746	92%	5349	0.2773	91%
quarter end training	5242	0.4850	38%	5349	0.3612	84%
1st quarter after training	5236	0.4967	56%	5349	0.4952	52%
2nd quarter after training	5232	0.4905	60%	5349	0.4889	58%
3rd quarter after training	5175	0.4883	61%	5349	0.4776	63%
4th quarter after training	5172	0.4908	60%	5349	0.4777	63%
5th quarter after training	5089	0.4886	61%	5349	0.4753	64%
6th quarter after training	4970	0.4877	61%	5349	0.4737	65%
7th quarter after training	4609	0.4761	65%	5349	0.4718	65%
8th quarter after training	4275	0.4652	68%	5349	0.4760	64%
9th quarter after training	3769	0.4686	67%	5044	0.4770	64%
10th quarter after training	3333	0.4741	66%	4709	0.4793	63%
11th quarter after training	2594	0.4640	69%	4327	0.4810	63%
12th quarter after training	2116	0.4731	66%	3891	0.4865	62%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

White

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	5163	0.2273	95%	5349	0.2980	90%
3 quarters before ui claim	5163	0.2171	95%	5349	0.2521	93%
2 quarters before ui claim	5163	0.2226	95%	5349	0.2465	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	5163	0.2746	92%	5349	0.2773	91%
quarter of ui claim	5163	0.3566	85%	5349	0.3612	84%
1st quarter after ui claim	5163	0.4553	29%	5349	0.4952	52%
2nd quarter after ui claim	5163	0.4733	34%	5349	0.4889	58%
3rd quarter after ui claim	5163	0.4995	48%	5349	0.4776	63%
4th quarter after ui claim	5163	0.4913	59%	5349	0.4777	63%
5th quarter after ui claim	5163	0.4696	67%	5349	0.4753	64%
6th quarter after ui claim	5163	0.4577	70%	5349	0.4737	65%
7th quarter after ui claim	5163	0.4545	71%	5349	0.4718	65%
8th quarter after ui claim	5163	0.4534	71%	5349	0.4760	64%
9th quarter after ui claim	5127	0.4561	70%	5044	0.4770	64%
10th quarter after ui claim	4890	0.4614	69%	4709	0.4793	63%
11th quarter after ui claim	4561	0.4676	68%	4327	0.4810	63%
12th quarter after ui claim	4103	0.4663	68%	3891	0.4865	62%

Table 7 cont.
POST-TRAINING APPROACH
African-American

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	1442	0.2804	91%	1406	0.3262	88%
3 quarters before ui claim	1442	0.2588	93%	1406	0.2938	91%
2 quarters before ui claim	1442	0.2633	93%	1406	0.2556	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	1442	0.2875	91%	1406	0.2952	91%
quarter end training	1467	0.4877	39%	1406	0.3888	82%
1st quarter after training	1463	0.4985	54%	1406	0.5040	52%
2nd quarter after training	1462	0.4936	58%	1406	0.4993	57%
3rd quarter after training	1443	0.4930	58%	1406	0.4882	63%
4th quarter after training	1443	0.4931	58%	1406	0.4827	64%
5th quarter after training	1417	0.4915	59%	1406	0.4784	66%
6th quarter after training	1389	0.4863	62%	1406	0.4780	66%
7th quarter after training	1295	0.4776	65%	1406	0.4755	67%
8th quarter after training	1198	0.4709	67%	1406	0.4741	67%
9th quarter after training	1059	0.4710	67%	1322	0.4761	66%
10th quarter after training	912	0.4739	66%	1198	0.4845	65%
11th quarter after training	751	0.4778	65%	1090	0.4887	63%
12th quarter after training	598	0.4849	62%	953	0.4868	64%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH
African-American

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	1442	0.2804	91%	1406	0.3262	88%
3 quarters before ui claim	1442	0.2588	93%	1406	0.2938	91%
2 quarters before ui claim	1442	0.2633	93%	1406	0.2556	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	1442	0.2875	91%	1406	0.2952	91%
quarter of ui claim	1442	0.3676	84%	1406	0.3888	82%
1st quarter after ui claim	1442	0.4652	32%	1406	0.5040	52%
2nd quarter after ui claim	1442	0.4801	36%	1406	0.4993	57%
3rd quarter after ui claim	1442	0.5001	49%	1406	0.4882	63%
4th quarter after ui claim	1442	0.4916	59%	1406	0.4827	64%
5th quarter after ui claim	1442	0.4759	65%	1406	0.4784	66%
6th quarter after ui claim	1442	0.4585	70%	1406	0.4780	66%
7th quarter after ui claim	1442	0.4582	70%	1406	0.4755	67%
8th quarter after ui claim	1442	0.4509	72%	1406	0.4741	67%
9th quarter after ui claim	1438	0.4574	70%	1322	0.4761	66%
10th quarter after ui claim	1365	0.4650	68%	1198	0.4845	65%
11th quarter after ui claim	1251	0.4696	67%	1090	0.4887	63%
12th quarter after ui claim	1114	0.4679	68%	953	0.4868	64%

Table 7 cont.

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

Hispanic

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	840	0.2616	93%	793	0.3702	85%
3 quarters before ui claim	840	0.2389	94%	793	0.2994	91%
2 quarters before ui claim	840	0.2389	94%	793	0.2564	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	840	0.2692	92%	793	0.2577	93%
quarter end training	847	0.4800	36%	793	0.3527	86%
1st quarter after training	846	0.4971	56%	793	0.5122	47%
2nd quarter after training	845	0.4916	59%	793	0.5074	58%
3rd quarter after training	839	0.4903	60%	793	0.4882	65%
4th quarter after training	838	0.4922	59%	793	0.4916	64%
5th quarter after training	827	0.4897	60%	793	0.4844	67%
6th quarter after training	811	0.4906	60%	793	0.4813	67%
7th quarter after training	767	0.4818	63%	793	0.4877	66%
8th quarter after training	707	0.4604	70%	793	0.4928	64%
9th quarter after training	633	0.4627	69%	732	0.4900	65%
10th quarter after training	545	0.4740	66%	679	0.4929	64%
11th quarter after training	460	0.4761	65%	614	0.4925	64%
12th quarter after training	328	0.4824	63%	545	0.5009	62%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

Hispanic

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	840	0.2616	93%	793	0.3702	85%
3 quarters before ui claim	840	0.2389	94%	793	0.2994	91%
2 quarters before ui claim	840	0.2389	94%	793	0.2564	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	840	0.2692	92%	793	0.2577	93%
quarter of ui claim	840	0.3740	83%	793	0.3527	86%
1st quarter after ui claim	840	0.4194	23%	793	0.5122	47%
2nd quarter after ui claim	840	0.4491	28%	793	0.5074	58%
3rd quarter after ui claim	840	0.4941	42%	793	0.4882	65%
4th quarter after ui claim	840	0.4952	57%	793	0.4916	64%
5th quarter after ui claim	840	0.4765	65%	793	0.4844	67%
6th quarter after ui claim	840	0.4616	69%	793	0.4813	67%
7th quarter after ui claim	840	0.4559	71%	793	0.4877	66%
8th quarter after ui claim	840	0.4601	70%	793	0.4928	64%
9th quarter after ui claim	838	0.4604	70%	732	0.4900	65%
10th quarter after ui claim	811	0.4626	69%	679	0.4929	64%
11th quarter after ui claim	755	0.4709	67%	614	0.4925	64%
12th quarter after ui claim	691	0.4689	67%	545	0.5009	62%

Table 8: Employment Rates by Educational Level

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

Less than high school

employment rate	sample size	std dev	ITG Group		Comparison Group	
			ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	445	0.2123	95%	429	0.3703	84%
3 quarters before ui claim	445	0.2074	96%	429	0.3118	90%
2 quarters before ui claim	445	0.1919	96%	429	0.2552	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	445	0.2695	92%	429	0.2663	93%
quarter end training	449	0.4781	35%	429	0.3791	83%
1st quarter after training	449	0.4985	55%	429	0.5098	49%
2nd quarter after training	449	0.4953	57%	429	0.5067	56%
3rd quarter after training	445	0.4949	58%	429	0.5009	59%
4th quarter after training	445	0.4952	57%	429	0.4960	62%
5th quarter after training	442	0.4971	56%	429	0.4962	61%
6th quarter after training	436	0.4944	58%	429	0.4927	63%
7th quarter after training	414	0.4852	62%	429	0.4988	60%
8th quarter after training	381	0.4797	64%	429	0.5016	59%
9th quarter after training	340	0.4829	63%	402	0.5026	60%
10th quarter after training	301	0.4918	59%	380	0.5042	59%
11th quarter after training	243	0.4890	61%	349	0.5058	57%
12th quarter after training	195	0.4931	59%	314	0.5088	56%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

Less than high school

employment rate	sample size	std dev	ITG Group		Comparison Group	
			ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	445	0.2123	95%	429	0.3703	84%
3 quarters before ui claim	445	0.2074	96%	429	0.3118	90%
2 quarters before ui claim	445	0.1919	96%	429	0.2552	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	445	0.2695	92%	429	0.2663	93%
quarter of ui claim	445	0.3728	83%	429	0.3791	83%
1st quarter after ui claim	445	0.4208	23%	429	0.5098	49%
2nd quarter after ui claim	445	0.4717	33%	429	0.5067	56%
3rd quarter after ui claim	445	0.5005	49%	429	0.5009	59%
4th quarter after ui claim	445	0.4918	59%	429	0.4960	62%
5th quarter after ui claim	445	0.4717	67%	429	0.4962	61%
6th quarter after ui claim	445	0.4732	66%	429	0.4927	63%
7th quarter after ui claim	445	0.4684	68%	429	0.4988	60%
8th quarter after ui claim	445	0.4717	67%	429	0.5016	59%
9th quarter after ui claim	442	0.4805	64%	402	0.5026	60%
10th quarter after ui claim	415	0.4862	62%	380	0.5042	59%
11th quarter after ui claim	387	0.4860	62%	349	0.5058	57%
12th quarter after ui claim	349	0.4870	62%	314	0.5088	56%

Table 8 cont.

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

High school

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	3393	0.2463	94%	3480	0.3076	89%
3 quarters before ui claim	3393	0.2333	94%	3480	0.2574	93%
2 quarters before ui claim	3393	0.2410	94%	3480	0.2527	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	3393	0.2805	91%	3480	0.2820	91%
quarter end training	3445	0.4864	38%	3480	0.3683	84%
1st quarter after training	3437	0.4948	57%	3480	0.4972	50%
2nd quarter after training	3436	0.4868	61%	3480	0.4902	58%
3rd quarter after training	3400	0.4849	62%	3480	0.4804	63%
4th quarter after training	3397	0.4870	61%	3480	0.4799	63%
5th quarter after training	3352	0.4843	62%	3480	0.4760	64%
6th quarter after training	3295	0.4829	63%	3480	0.4724	66%
7th quarter after training	3088	0.4728	66%	3480	0.4730	65%
8th quarter after training	2854	0.4603	70%	3480	0.4765	64%
9th quarter after training	2540	0.4619	69%	3260	0.4784	64%
10th quarter after training	2234	0.4671	68%	3042	0.4812	63%
11th quarter after training	1799	0.4671	68%	2793	0.4817	63%
12th quarter after training	1414	0.4717	67%	2480	0.4852	61%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

High school

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	3393	0.2463	94%	3480	0.3076	89%
3 quarters before ui claim	3393	0.2333	94%	3480	0.2574	93%
2 quarters before ui claim	3393	0.2410	94%	3480	0.2527	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	3393	0.2805	91%	3480	0.2820	91%
quarter of ui claim	3393	0.3574	85%	3480	0.3683	84%
1st quarter after ui claim	3393	0.4511	28%	3480	0.4972	50%
2nd quarter after ui claim	3393	0.4727	34%	3480	0.4902	58%
3rd quarter after ui claim	3393	0.4997	48%	3480	0.4804	63%
4th quarter after ui claim	3393	0.4894	60%	3480	0.4799	63%
5th quarter after ui claim	3393	0.4644	69%	3480	0.4760	64%
6th quarter after ui claim	3393	0.4518	71%	3480	0.4724	66%
7th quarter after ui claim	3393	0.4461	73%	3480	0.4730	65%
8th quarter after ui claim	3393	0.4463	73%	3480	0.4765	64%
9th quarter after ui claim	3376	0.4477	72%	3260	0.4784	64%
10th quarter after ui claim	3242	0.4567	70%	3042	0.4812	63%
11th quarter after ui claim	3009	0.4621	69%	2793	0.4817	63%
12th quarter after ui claim	2694	0.4618	69%	2480	0.4852	61%

Table 8 cont.

POST-TRAINING APPROACH

Some college

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	2460	0.2488	93%	2608	0.3081	89%
3 quarters before ui claim	2460	0.2317	94%	2608	0.2652	92%
2 quarters before ui claim	2460	0.2408	94%	2608	0.2484	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	2460	0.2860	91%	2608	0.2792	91%
quarter end training	2487	0.4855	38%	2608	0.3598	84%
1st quarter after training	2485	0.4972	55%	2608	0.4875	51%
2nd quarter after training	2481	0.4919	59%	2608	0.4810	58%
3rd quarter after training	2448	0.4895	60%	2608	0.4651	65%
4th quarter after training	2447	0.4912	59%	2608	0.4634	66%
5th quarter after training	2392	0.4897	60%	2608	0.4608	66%
6th quarter after training	2319	0.4870	61%	2608	0.4577	67%
7th quarter after training	2129	0.4722	66%	2608	0.4567	68%
8th quarter after training	1981	0.4618	69%	2608	0.4597	67%
9th quarter after training	1739	0.4678	68%	2453	0.4604	66%
10th quarter after training	1516	0.4688	67%	2242	0.4632	66%
11th quarter after training	1204	0.4591	70%	2053	0.4643	65%
12th quarter after training	961	0.4733	66%	1834	0.4662	64%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

Some college

employment rate	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	2460	0.2488	93%	2608	0.3081	89%
3 quarters before ui claim	2460	0.2317	94%	2608	0.2652	92%
2 quarters before ui claim	2460	0.2408	94%	2608	0.2484	93%
1 quarter before ui claim	2460	0.2860	91%	2608	0.2792	91%
quarter of ui claim	2460	0.3717	83%	2608	0.3598	84%
1st quarter after ui claim	2460	0.4495	28%	2608	0.4875	51%
2nd quarter after ui claim	2460	0.4672	32%	2608	0.4810	58%
3rd quarter after ui claim	2460	0.4981	45%	2608	0.4651	65%
4th quarter after ui claim	2460	0.4933	58%	2608	0.4634	66%
5th quarter after ui claim	2460	0.4724	66%	2608	0.4608	66%
6th quarter after ui claim	2460	0.4505	72%	2608	0.4577	67%
7th quarter after ui claim	2460	0.4528	71%	2608	0.4567	68%
8th quarter after ui claim	2460	0.4479	72%	2608	0.4597	67%
9th quarter after ui claim	2448	0.4522	71%	2453	0.4604	66%
10th quarter after ui claim	2344	0.4555	71%	2242	0.4632	66%
11th quarter after ui claim	2188	0.4660	68%	2053	0.4643	65%
12th quarter after ui claim	1981	0.4605	70%	1834	0.4662	64%

Table 8 cont.**POST-TRAINING APPROACH**

College	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
employment rate	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	1353	0.2332	94%	1269	0.3079	90%
3 quarters before ui claim	1353	0.2231	95%	1269	0.2819	92%
2 quarters before ui claim	1353	0.2124	95%	1269	0.2445	94%
1 quarter before ui claim	1353	0.2544	93%	1269	0.2775	92%
quarter end training	1384	0.4801	36%	1269	0.3625	85%
1st quarter after training	1383	0.5000	51%	1269	0.5079	53%
2nd quarter after training	1382	0.4972	55%	1269	0.5055	56%
3rd quarter after training	1373	0.4964	56%	1269	0.4947	62%
4th quarter after training	1372	0.4978	55%	1269	0.4958	61%
5th quarter after training	1354	0.4949	57%	1269	0.4932	62%
6th quarter after training	1323	0.4951	57%	1269	0.4983	60%
7th quarter after training	1235	0.4903	60%	1269	0.4910	63%
8th quarter after training	1148	0.4814	64%	1269	0.4930	62%
9th quarter after training	1008	0.4811	64%	1207	0.4919	64%
10th quarter after training	887	0.4888	61%	1128	0.4977	64%
11th quarter after training	672	0.4813	64%	1025	0.5051	64%
12th quarter after training	561	0.4887	61%	932	0.5145	63%

POST-UNEMPLOYMENT APPROACH

College	ITG Group			Comparison Group		
employment rate	sample size	std dev	ITG employment rate	sample size	std dev	Comparison employment rate
4 quarters before ui claim	1353	0.2332	94%	1269	0.3079	90%
3 quarters before ui claim	1353	0.2231	95%	1269	0.2819	92%
2 quarters before ui claim	1353	0.2124	95%	1269	0.2445	94%
1 quarter before ui claim	1353	0.2544	93%	1269	0.2775	92%
quarter of ui claim	1353	0.3483	86%	1269	0.3625	85%
1st quarter after ui claim	1353	0.4754	34%	1269	0.5079	53%
2nd quarter after ui claim	1353	0.4791	36%	1269	0.5055	56%
3rd quarter after ui claim	1353	0.4995	47%	1269	0.4947	62%
4th quarter after ui claim	1353	0.4957	57%	1269	0.4958	61%
5th quarter after ui claim	1353	0.4871	61%	1269	0.4932	62%
6th quarter after ui claim	1353	0.4797	64%	1269	0.4983	60%
7th quarter after ui claim	1353	0.4744	66%	1269	0.4910	63%
8th quarter after ui claim	1353	0.4736	66%	1269	0.4930	62%
9th quarter after ui claim	1342	0.4758	65%	1207	0.4919	64%
10th quarter after ui claim	1262	0.4772	65%	1128	0.4977	64%
11th quarter after ui claim	1172	0.4831	63%	1025	0.5051	64%
12th quarter after ui claim	1041	0.4825	63%	932	0.5145	63%

Table 9: ITG Training Customer Satisfaction Survey Results

How valuable was the training you received?	Fared better	Fared Worse
Highly valuable	42.4	28.6
Somewhat Valuable	41.2	51.8
Fair	9.4	7.7
Not Valuable	5.6	10.7
No response/don't know	1.5	1.19

How would you rate your satisfaction?	Fared better	Fared Worse
Highly Satisfied	65.4	60.4
Somewhat Satisfied	23.5	24.7
Fair	4.8	9.1
Not Satisfied	5.1	3.9
No response/don't know	1.2	2.0